

REMARKS

Claims 1-39 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of January 24, 2008 all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1-3, 5-8, 13-15, 18, 22-27, 30-33 and 35-39 are amended, and claim 34 is cancelled. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Support for the amendments can be found at least from page 17, lines 22-24 of the specification.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

Abstract

The abstract of the disclosure is amended to comply with the requirements listed on page 2 of the Office Action. The abstract is now believed to be on a single page, be 150 words or less, and not recite implied language. No new matter is added. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the abstract.

Specification

On page 3 of the Office Action, the specification is objected to for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that at least page 11, lines 16-32 provide proper support for the subject matter recited in now amended claim 33. Applicant respectfully submits that one of skill in the art would understand that the discussion at the section of the specification identified above provides proper support and disclosure for the limitations recited in claim 33.

Claim Objections

Claims 27 and 35 are amended to recite the correct spelling of “assigned.” Therefore, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objects to claims 27 and 35.

Claim Rejections Under § 101

Claims 31 and 32 are amended to recite “a computer readable storage medium embedded with a computer program...” Applicant respectfully submits that claims 31 and 32, as amended,

are in proper format, and therefore recite statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 34 is moot in view of the cancellation of claim 34.

Claim Rejections Under § 102

In section 14, on page 7 of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 13, 17, 27-28, 30-35, 37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Brechner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,741,996). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Brechner, because Brechner fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Brechner at least fails to disclose or suggest that context information is related to at least one current condition of the mobile terminal device at the time of a user operation, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least this reason claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Brechner.

Claim 1 recites obtaining user provided information in consequence to any user operation on a mobile terminal device. The context information is associated with the user provided information, and meta-information is obtained from the context information and assigned to the user provided information. Brechner is generally related to a method for hierarchically organizing files of a selected type to enable a user to efficiently access desired files from among the files of the selected type in a storage area. See Brechner column 2, lines 5-8. Metadata is automatically associated with each file in a collection, and the metadata includes keywords derived from the folder path associated with each file in the collection hierarchy. See Brechner column 2, line 66—column 3, line 3.

In contrast to Brechner, claim 1 recites that the meta-information is obtained from context information which is related to at least one current condition of the mobile terminal device at the time of the user operation. In Brechner, the metadata is obtained from the folder path in which each file is stored. The folder path is not related to at least one current condition of the mobile terminal device, but instead is the information related to storage of the particular file. The “contextual information” discussed in Brechner is entirely distinct from the “context information” recited in claim 1, because the context information is related to at least one current condition of the mobile terminal device and the “contextual information” is only based on the names in the folder path where the file is stored. See Brechner column 6, lines 7-11. Brechner states that it is generally assumed that user will typically store media files within a folder structure based upon the content or subject matter of the media files, and the folder path is

parsed by the Clip Organizer software to identify keywords for inclusion in the metadata for the file. See Brechner column 10, lines 45-54. However, the content or subject matter of the media files in Brechner is not related to the current condition of a mobile terminal device as in claim 1, but instead only relates to the media files. Therefore, for a least this reason claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Brechner.

Independent claims 35 and 39 are amended to contain limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, claims 35 and 39 are not disclosed or suggested by Brechner.

The dependent claims rejected above are not disclosed or suggested by Brechner at least in view of their dependencies.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 17, on page 28 of the Office Action, claims 6-9, 11-12, 29 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brechner et al. in view of Vronay et al. (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2003/0156138). Vronay fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Brechner identified above with respect to claims 1 and 35, and therefore the dependent claims rejected above are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 18, on page 35 of the Office Action, claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brechner et al. in view of Vronay, and further view of Gupta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,156). Vronay and Gupta fail to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Brechner identified above with respect to claims 1 and 35, and therefore the dependent claims rejected above are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 19, on page 37 of the Office Action, claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brechner et al. in view of Asazu (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2001/0049691). Asazu fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Brechner identified above with respect to claim 1, and therefore the dependent claims rejected above are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 20, on page 39 of the Office Action, claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brechner et al. in view of Gupta. Gupta fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Brechner identified above with respect to claim 1, and therefore the dependent claims rejected above are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 21, on page 41 of the Office Action, claims 18, 20, 23 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brechner et al. in view of Tecu et al. (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2004/0034655). Tecu fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Brechner identified above with respect to claims 1 and 35, and therefore the dependent claims rejected above are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 22, on page 45 of the Office Action, claims 19, 21-22, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brechner et al. in view of Tecu, and in further view of Tsuruoka (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,056). Tecu and Tsuruoka fail to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Brechner identified above with respect to claim 1, and therefore the dependent claims rejected above are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 23, on page 51 of the Office Action, claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Brechner et al. in view of Tecu and Tsuruoka, and in further view of Levy et al. (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2002/0031240). Tecu, Tsuruoka and Levy fail to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Brechner identified above with respect to claim 1, and therefore the dependent claims rejected above are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 15 April 2008

Keith R. Obert

Keith R. Obert
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys
& Adolphson LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
Customer No. 004955